

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/543,612	04/05/2000	Brian T. Cunningham	DR-308J	6510	
7	590 08/25/2004		EXAM	INER	
Joseph S Iandiorio Iandiorio & Teska 260 Bear Hill Road		ı	, CHAPMAN	, CHAPMAN JR, JOHN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Waltham, MA 02451-1018			2856		
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/543,612	CUNNINGHAM ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John E Chapman	2856				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears amination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chipitation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of	•					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most partner patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI).						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) M they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 26-42.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
0. Other:		John E Chapman Primary Examiner				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/543,612

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The changes to the claims are substantive and not mere typographical errors. The dependency of claims 31-33 has been changed, and it is not clear that there is support in the disclosure for a second and a third transducer on a piezoelectric layer, as recited in claim 32. Furthermore, such may necessitate a new ground of rejection.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive. The level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art is a factual inquiry to be resolved in determination of obviousness under 35 USC 103, as set forth in Graham v. John Deere. The fact that the level is high does not preclude a determination of obviousness.